

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 15-37 are now pending in this application.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to the claims.

Amendments to the specification were to correct minor grammatical, typographical, and formatting errors.

Rejections of claims 1-14

Claims 1-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,101,883 ("Kinmartin"). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinmartin in view of U.S. Patent 6,575,701 ("Kamiya"). Claims 1-14 have been canceled, which renders these rejections moot. Favorable reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Allowability of claims 15-37

New claims 15-37 have been added, which are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 15 recites "an air-guiding device comprising a plurality of subducts for dividing air in the air-guiding device, and an outflow region with an outer circumferential region and a middle region and, wherein one subduct leads to the middle region and another subduct leads to the outer circumferential region." Kinmartin merely discloses ducts that are arranged side by side and none of the ducts is a subduct that leads to an outer circumferential region. Kamiya does not cure this deficiency because Kamiya merely discloses a casing for an interior air blower. (See Abstract and column 5, lines 51-67 of Kamiya). There is no motivation for one with ordinary skill in the art to use the blower casing of Kamiya in the distribution duct of Kinmartin. Indeed, distribution ducts and blower casings have totally different functions and design considerations. Thus, the rejection based on the combination of Kinmartin and Kamiya is improper. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 28 recites "wherein the air-guiding device comprises a plurality of subducts for dividing air in the air-guiding device, and wherein one subduct has a coiled or elongated, helical region." The prior art does not teach or suggest this combination of features. As

conceded by the PTO in relation to claim 10 (now canceled), Kinmartin does not teach a coiled or elongate, helical region. (See page 4 of the Office Action.) Kamiya does not cure this deficiency because its teachings relate to blowers not distribution ducts. Distribution ducts and blower casings have totally different functions and design considerations; and one with ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use the blower casing of Kamiya in the distribution duct of Kinmartin. Thus, claim 28 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 33 recites “ wherein the air-guiding device comprises a plurality of subducts for dividing air in the air-guiding device, and wherein one of the subducts is configured to impart a spot action to the air at an exit of the air duct and another of the subducts is configured to impart a swirl to the air at the exit of the air duct.” Kinmartin merely discloses ducts that are arranged side by side and none of the ducts impart a swirl. Kamiya does not cure this deficiency because its teachings relate to blowers not distribution ducts. Distribution ducts and blower casings have totally different functions and design considerations; and one with ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use the blower casing of Kamiya in the distribution duct of Kinmartin. Thus, claim 33 is allowable over the prior art.

Claims 16-27, 29-32, and 34-37 depend from and contain all the features of either claim 15, 28, or 33, and are allowable therewith for at least the same reasons provided above, without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, allowance of claims 15-37 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for

such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to
Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

3/6/2007

By

Matthew J. Kremer

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5414

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Richard L. Schwaab

Registration No. 25,479

Matthew J. Kremer

Registration No. 58,671